REMARKS

Status Summary

Claims 1-10 and 12-40 are pending in the present application, of which claims 1, 10, 23, 34, and 35 are presented in independent form. Claims 1-10 and 12-40 stand rejected.

Interview

Applicants express their gratitude to the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicants' undersigned representative during the telephone interview conducted on September 21, 2007. During that interview potential claim amendments to the independent claims were discussed. The claims have been amended in the manner kindly suggested by the examiner.

In particular, the independent claims have been amended to include a recitation, among others, directed to "a TCP-IP protocol stack that enables wireless communication between the entity-specific network-enabled image capture devices and the online photo-sharing service via a wireless Internet connection."

Claim Objection(s)

Various claims have been objected to in the application for informalities. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's careful review of the claims and suggestions, and have amended the claims to address the Examiner's concerns where considered appropriate. In particular, claims 1, 10, and 34-35 have been amended to recite "configured to" in place of "configured for" as per the Examiner's suggestions.

The claim amendments discussed above have been entered to address concerns raised by the Examiner in examining the claims and to advance prosecution of this application. The amendments were made for reasons either unrelated to or, at most, tangentially related to the statutory requirements for a patent, and have not

narrowed the scope of the claims. Accordingly, those interpreting these claims should not limit them to their literal scopes.

Claim Rejection(s) - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5, 10, 12-17, 23-26 and 34-40 stand rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,650,831 to Thompson (hereinafter "Thompson"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,930,709 to Creamer, et al. (hereinafter "Creamer").

As to claim 1, amended claim 1 includes a recitation directed to "a TCP-IP protocol stack that enables wireless communication between the entity-specific network-enabled image capture devices and the online photo-sharing service via a wireless Internet connection," The Office Action cites Thompson as teaching a method for providing access to respective entity-specific photo-sharing websites for a plurality of entities, each entity controlling a set of entity-specific network-enabled image capture devices. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Thompson does not discuss a camera having any network connectivity capabilities at all, much less wireless connectivity capabilities. Thompson discloses two methods of providing images from a camera to an image hosting provider. First, Thompson discloses a method including physically mailing the camera to the image hosting provider. Thompson states at column 6, lines 32-54:

> Also preferably a return address and pre-paid postage is pre-printed on the inside surface 96 of the back panel 90 such that when the cover 80 is reversed and fixed in the inoperable position, the return address and pre-paid postage is exposed and visible. Thus, when the user is finished with the camera 44, the cover 80 can be reversed and fixed into the inoperable position, which protects the lens and renders the camera inoperable. Then the camera 44 can be conveniently deposited into the nearest postal receptacle. As above, the camera can include the network access information printed thereon, or a code associated with the network access information, which information is used by the photo processor/image hosting service provider to post the photographic images on a server connected to the network.

> Referring to FIG. 12, a disposable camera 120 can be provided with a protective and disabling mailing cover 122 which includes adhesive means, such as a pressure-sensitive adhesive on a back surface thereof for attachment to the camera 120 over the lens (front) thereof. The cover 122 can include a return address and pre-paid postage thereon. Thus the cover 122 can be used to disable the camera 120 and to address and send the camera to the photo processor and image hosting service provider.

The above described method of physically mailing the camera to the image hosting service cannot possibly be said to disclose or suggest a wireless internet connection between the camera and the online photo-sharing service.

Thompson discloses an alternative method to physically mailing the camera to the image hosting provider using a client program on a computer to read the photographic image data from the camera and transmit it to the image hosting provider. Specifically, Thompson states in column 7, lines 27-37:

> To accomplish this alternative method of electronically transmitting the photographic images to the image hosting service provider, the photographer can employ a "client" program running on, for example, a personal computer connected to the network. The client program is programmed to read the photographic image data recorded on the storage media, and to read the network access information associated with the storage media, and is programmed to transmit such information to the image hosting service provider. One skilled in the art, would be able to develop such a client program with minimal effort.

The above described method of using a personal computer to read data from the camera and then transmit the information to the image hosting service cannot possibly be said to disclose or suggest a wireless internet connection between the camera and the online photo-sharing service.

Further, the Office admits that "Thompson does not teach including a TCP-IP protocol stack that enables communication between the entity-specific network-enabled image capture devices and the online photo-sharing service via an Internet connection." As such, Thompson can not be said to disclose or suggest "a TCP-IP protocol stack that enables wireless communication between the entity-specific network-enabled image

capture devices and the online photo-sharing service via a wireless Internet connection" as recited in claim 1.

The Office Action cites Creamer et al. as teaching an integrated internet/intranet camera including a TCP-IP protocol stack that enables communication between the camera and the internet. Applicants respectfully asserts that Creamer fails to cure the deficiencies of Thompson in failing to disclose or suggest "a TCP-IP protocol stack that enables wireless communication between the entity-specific network-enabled image capture devices and the online photo-sharing service via a wireless Internet connection" as recited in claim 1.

Creamer discloses an internet camera that uses telephone lines and telephone transmission protocols to connect the camera to the internet. Specifically, Creamer states at column 3 line 60 – column 4 line 5 and column 6, lines 35-42:

> The network interface device may include a modem for connecting to a telephone system connected to the Internet. In this case, the transmission initiating device includes a telephone conversion device that initiates a telephone connection with the Internet via the modem according to a predetermined telephone transmission protocol, and that converts between the predetermined telephone transmission protocol and the predetermined Internet transport control protocol. Accordingly, the integrated Internet camera may perform the recited functions over a public or private telephone network, or any network or connection using telephone transmission protocols or analog data transmission.
>
> As shown in FIG. 2, the camera 1 may be connected to the Internet via a network interface device 236 (comprising, e.g., a modem or network card) and a connection cable 237 (which may be a telephone wire connected to the public network or a network cable connected to a local or wide area network). Preferably, the camera body includes a threaded camera mount, and is sized and shaped to fit industry standard environmental housings for outdoor use.

As described in the above cited sections, the internet camera of Creamer requires a connection cable and a modem or network card to connect to the Internet. Accordingly, as stated above, Creamer fails to cure the deficiencies of Thompson in failing to disclose or suggest "a TCP-IP protocol stack that enables wireless communication

between the entity-specific network-enabled image capture devices and the online photo-sharing service via a wireless Internet connection" as recited in claim 1

As such, since the cited documents fail to disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations for at least the above reasons, the obviousness rejections of claim 1 should be withdrawn. Furthermore, rejected claims 2-9, 31, 36, and 37 are novel and inventive for at least the same reasons. Claims 10, 23, 34, and 35 contains analogous recitations to those discussed above with reference to claim 1. As such, the obviousness rejections of claim 10 should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons. Further, claims 12- 22, 24-30, 32-33, and 38 are novel and inventive for at least the same reasons.

Further, Thompson does not describe an arrangement in which one or more of the websites is "customized in appearance to a corresponding one or more of the plurality of entities" as recited in claim 1. Instead, as discussed in previous communications, Thompson describes an arrangement providing a single website for a single entity, i.e., the hosting service provider 10, that has a plurality of webpages for cameras having different serial numbers. Thompson does not describe that the website of the hosting service provider 10 (or the webpages within that single website, for that matter) is customized in any manner for an entity controlling a set of entity-specific network-enabled image capture devices.

Thompson's description of providing reserved access information (see, e.g., column 2, lines 22-26 and 54-65; column 3, lines 59-63; and column 5, lines 5-27) that is associated with reserved locations (see, e.g., column 2, lines 40-43 and column 4, lines 33-37), along with allowing for the purchasing of such reserved network access information in commodity form (see, e.g., column 4, lines 13-20, teaches away from an arrangement in which an online service provider provides customized entity-specific websites for a plurality of entities, as recited in claim 1. Moreover, because Thompson describes an arrangement with only one entity, Thompson cannot be said to disclose or

suggest customization to preserve the look and feel of the entity's existing website and to distinguish the website from other websites.

In contrast, claim 1 provides that when a plurality of image capture devices having different controlling entities connect to the single photo-sharing service via the network, the photo-sharing service uses an entity ID received from the image capture devices to provide access to respective websites that are customized in appearance for the different controlling entities—not merely access to different webpages that exist within the common website of the online photo-sharing service as Thompson describes. Moreover, one or more of the entity-specific photo-sharing websites is customized in appearance for a corresponding one or more of the plurality of entities. Thompson fails to disclose or suggest the above recitations. Further, the Office Action relies solely on Thompson for describing the absent features discussed above. Indeed, the Office relies on the secondary document to Creamer only to purportedly demonstrate the existence of an integrated Internet/intranet camera having a TCP/IP protocol stack. Creamer fails to cure the deficiencies of Thompson in failing to disclose or suggest "one or more of the websites is customized in appearance to a corresponding one or more of the plurality of entities" as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, since the cited documents fail to disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations for the above reasons as well, the obviousness rejections of claims 1 should be withdrawn. Furthermore, rejected claims 2-9, 31, 36, and 37 are novel and inventive for at least the same reasons. Claims 10, 23, 34, and 35 contains analogous recitations to those discussed above with reference to claim 1. As such, the obviousness rejections of claims 10, 23, 34, and 35 should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons. Further, claims 12- 22, 24-30, 32-33, and 38 are novel and inventive for at least the same reasons.

Further, in rejecting various dependent claims, the Office cites U.S. Patent No. 6,017,157 to Garfinkle, et al. (hereinafter, "Garfinkle") and U.S. Patent No. 6,035,323 to Narayen, et al. (hereinafter, "Narayen"). Applicants respectfully assert that these

documents also fail to cure the deficiencies of Thompson and Creamer discussed above. As such, for at least the reasons stated above, Applicants assert that claims 1-10 and 12-40 are novel and inventive.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in proper condition for allowance, and an early notice to such effect is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned patent attorney at the below-listed number if, after reviewing the above Remarks, the Examiner believes outstanding matters remain that may be resolved without the issuance of a subsequent Official Action.

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, or credit any overpayment, associated with the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. **50-3512**.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 19, 2007

/John A. Demos/

Customer No: 49278
111 Corning Road; Ste. 220
Cary, North Carolina 27518
919 233 1942 x219 (voice)
919 233 9907 (fax)

John A. Demos
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 52,809